

## REMARKS

This application was filed with Claims 1-54. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-54 are now pending in the application.

In the Office Action, Claims 9, 10 and 13-54 are allowed; Claims 4-7, 11, and 12 are objected to; and Claims 1-3 are rejected.

## CLAIMS OBJECTED To

Claims 4-7, 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim 4 has been cancelled and its features incorporated into amended Claim 1. Claim 11 has been amended to independent form by incorporating all of the limitations of original Claim 1, upon which it had depended. Claims 5-7 and 12 depend directly or indirectly from amended Claim 1.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) on the basis of Sasaki (USPN 4,642,273) for the reasons of record.

The Office Action states:

... the primary reference Sasaki *et al.* discloses a single reactor, while the secondary reactor reference Acker would require plural reactors. The two references to [sic] not teach how to modify a fuel cell reforming system with an output control value and a single reactor to include plural reactors.

Claim 1 as amended includes a second reactor and the arrangement of the reactors and the valve as in allowable Claim 4. Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of original Claim 4, which is now cancelled.

Thus, Claim 1 as amended is patentable over the art of record. Claims 2 and 3, which depend directly from Claim 1, are submitted to meet the criteria for novelty for the reasons given below with respect to amended Claim 1.

In summary, allowable features of Claim 4 has been included in Claim 1. Claims 2 and 3 now depend from Claim 1 and are allowable. Allowable features of Claims 1 and 11 are combined in new independent Claim 11. Claim 12 now depends on Claim 11. Such amendments are being made to facilitate issuance of allowable subject matter without acquiescing as to the correctness of the rejection.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this

application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 23 APRIL 04

By: Linda M. Deschere  
Linda M. Deschere  
Reg. No. 34,811

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

LDES/lf-s

G:\ldescher\8540G (General Motors Corporation)\000004\Final OA (due 05-25-04)\Amendment.doc